## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/802,425	BASSLER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	MICHELE K. JOIKE	1636		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.		
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the (3) a Request	
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(</li> </ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as	
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	nsideration and/or search (see NO <sup>-</sup> w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	TE below); ducing or simplifying t		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)  6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	: <u>35 U.S.C. 112(1)</u> .			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed: 99 and 100.  Claim(s) objected to: 2 and 41.  Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-36,39,40,42-48.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		l be entered and an e	xplanation of	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a	
10. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		·		
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see attached.</li> </ol>	,	n condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: <u>see attached sheets regarding petition</u> .				
	/David Guzo/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1636			

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

Cont. of 11. The 37 C.F.R. 1.132 declarations, dated 3/19/08 and 3/20/08, state that Bonnie Bassler and Michael Surette are the "sole inventors of the invention of claims 1, 3-36, 39-40 and 42-47" in the instant application. However, in the petition filed under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) (dated 4/23/08), it is stated that "[t]he inventors of the claims currently under prosecution are Bonnie Bassler, Michael Surette, Stephan Schauder and Kevin Shokat." Because of these two contradictory statements, it is unclear who the inventors are of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the 102(e) rejection still stands.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection also still stands.